



**N126 LSR Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment
Bureau of Land Management, Siuslaw Field Office
Public Workshop # 3
October 30, 2018, 1:00 p.m. –4:00 p.m.
Summary**

Workshop Overview

On October 30, 2018, the Siuslaw Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management convened a public workshop with key stakeholders to discuss potential issues and alternatives to be considered for the N126 LSR Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment (N126 plan). This plan will cover approximately 25,000 acres of Late-Successional Reserve (LSR) and Riparian Reserve within the Siuslaw Field Office boundary in Lane County, Oregon. Anticipated activities include commercial thinning and restoration activities to speed the development of northern spotted owl habitat throughout the landscape. Subsequent site-specific treatments will be developed through Determinations of NEPA adequacy. This plan is anticipated to guide management for the next five to ten years.

This workshop was the third of three consecutive public workshops scheduled during the pre-scoping planning phase. The objectives of the third workshop were to review the updated purpose and need, address corollary topics discussed during the first two workshops, and identify the issues and potential alternatives stakeholders would like considered for analysis in the EA. Meeting participants reviewed the issues and alternatives that had already been identified throughout earlier discussions and developed certain issues and alternatives in more detail. The interdisciplinary team charged with completing the analysis will use this input as a starting point to develop what is included in the environmental assessment. Please see the agenda for more information.

The following is a list of workshop participants and comments provided.

Workshop Attendees

- Amanda Astor, American Forest Resource Council
- Antonia Blum, Big Bear Retreat Center/property owner
- Doug Eisler, Siuslaw Watershed Council
- Les Fetter, Siuslaw Watershed Council
- Doug Heiken, Oregon Wild
- Gabriel Scott, Cascadia Wildlands
- Eli Tome, Siuslaw Watershed Council

- Jose Mercado, United States Forest Service
- Cheryl Adcock, Bureau of Land Management
- Joshua Carnahan, Bureau of Land Management
- Chris Finn, Bureau of Land Management
- Randy Miller, Bureau of Land Management
- Jan Robbins, Bureau of Land Management
- Nick Scheidt, Bureau of Land Management
- Morgan Schneider, Bureau of Land Management
- Emily Timoshevskiy, Bureau of Land Management
- Phyllis Trimble, Bureau of Land Management
- Sara Wernecke, Bureau of Land Management

Discussion Summary

Updated Purpose and Need Discussion

Joshua Carnahan, BLM, explained that the draft purpose and need statement was revised to no longer include non-ASQ targets based on feedback provided at previous public workshops. He also explained that there may be a change in the project boundary to include additional acreage located in the Salem District in order to create consistency among LSR treatments, particularly within watersheds.

Questions and comments included:

- There are several references to open grown trees in the purpose and need. Concerns exist that this will result in too many open stands. Canopy cover is important.
- There is not much research on efficacy of thinning in a mature forest. Please focus on functionality of stands as opposed to just age classes.
- Please articulate that stands already meeting desired conditions will not be treated. Highlight where passive management is an active decision.
- Review the language around the 20-year impact requirements. Can this be minimized?
- Be cautious of having too broad of a purpose and need statement.

Issues Related to Landscape Plan

Joshua addressed several topics that are related to the landscape plan but that will not be included in the EA, including the aquatic restoration EA, limitations of stewardship contracting, management of invasive species guidelines, and the process for developing DNAs from the plan.

Questions and comments included:

- Is it possible to call out in the plan the types of tools that are available to complete restoration work on the landscape?
- Show justification why the BLM needs to thin stands to accomplish restoration.
- Consider utilizing the Good Neighbor Authority to accomplish restoration work.
- Describe stands in other ways than using stand age.
- What does delaying nesting-roosting habitat by more than 20 years mean?

- Make sure the purpose and need responds to all aspects of these stands on the ground. Scope and scale of the purpose and need are appropriate.
- Be clear in the EA about how effects will be treated in a DNA.
- Surveys on the ground are, and should be, rigorous at the DNA level.
- Is it possible to access DNA documentation without making a FOIA request?
- Non-plantation stands are significantly more complex than plantation stands. How do we ensure the analysis of a DNA is sufficient?
- Public involvement at the DNA stage?
 - 15 day public comment period
 - Could there be field trips to specific units during design?

Identification of Issues

Elizabeth Spaulding, facilitator, presented a list of issues to be considered for analysis that were identified throughout the stakeholder assessment and previous public workshops. Meeting participants reviewed this list and identified additional issues they believe are important for consideration. These issues include:

- Roads
 - Site specific analysis and sideboards (How can roads be placed on the landscape?)
 - Wise use
 - Restoration versus environmental and economic impacts
 - Travel Management Plan; minimum road analysis (Cost to maintain roads x miles of roads vs. amount of funds available)
 - Costs of road maintenance and decommissioning
- Invasive species management
 - Certain plants (ex: blackberries) grow and prevent public access
 - Insects that are attacking Salal
 - Barred Owl
- Recreation opportunities
- Deadwood recruitment
 - Non-commercial treatment in variety of age classes
 - Pre-commercial treatments in young stands 10-25 years old.
- Riparian Reserves as migration corridors
- Managed restoration versus natural processes
 - Commercial; non-commercial; natural
 - Treated historically?
- Abundance versus access to prey species
- Impacts of drought
 - Climate change
 - Pathogens and insects
 - Invasives, such as thripp
 - Water storage
 - Carbon storage
 - Genetic selection- artificial vs. natural
- Water rights and quality
 - Monitoring!

- Recognized legal rights versus rights by use
- Human habitat; impacts to neighbors
 - Traffic
 - Access/escape routes
 - Effects from fire
 - Buffers
- Economics
 - Pros and cons of specific treatments and alternatives
 - Impacts of lighter treatments
 - Number and types of jobs created
 - Social cost of carbon emissions
- Soil productivity
 - Slash loads vs. fuel loads
- 20-year impacts
 - Alternatives and effects
 - Metrics
- Marble Murrelet /Coho Salmon /Northern Spotted Owl /Red Tree Voles
- How is this EA in conformance with the RMP?

Identification and Discussion of Alternatives

Elizabeth presented an initial list of alternatives for consideration that were identified throughout previous workshops. Meeting participants reviewed this list and identified the following additional alternatives for potential inclusion in the EA:

- State coordination and involvement
- Light thinning in wind throw prone areas
- Light versus moderate thinning in owl occupied stands
- Light thinning everywhere with group selection openings
- Mosaic thinning, patches of hardwoods and conifer
- Plant drought resistant species
- Fire as disturbance in stands with no commercial treatments
- Incidental take of northern spotted owl
- Landscape health/fragmentation/connectivity
- Deadwood creation only
- Buffers against corvids
- Non-commercial treatment on everything
 - Vary based on invasive species design
- Recreation as a by-product
- Road management
- Stand complexity
 - Break it down
- Maximum versus minimums
- Varied proportions of activities
 - Sideboards on how to incorporate into DNA
 - Triggers vary treatments
 - 1/3 light thinning, 1/3 heavy thinning, 1/3 no treatment

- Skips and gaps
 - Treat vs. non-treated areas
- Technology improvements
 - Benefits and design of certain equipment
 - Disturbance and feasibility
 - Minimal negative impacts
- Develop sideboards for when to treat older stands, or stands with larger DBH
 - Older stands should include additional care and scrutiny
- Strategies for larger blocks of land versus checkerboard ownership
- Examine a 5-year delay versus 20-year delay
 - Canopy cover
 - Leave dense pole stands
 - More skips; connection to riparian reserves
- Develop an alternative that focuses solely on volume
 - Maximum and minimum skips and gaps
 - Ratios
 - Economics
 - Treatment versus no treatment
- Levels of thinning regarding proximity to occupancy
- Please no bookend alternatives
- Roads analysis
 - No new stream crossings
 - Metrics
 - Articulate logical decision-making
 - What are the impacts and the benefits?
 - Process for implementers to follow
 - Final entry and decommissioning

Communication and Outreach

Meeting participants identified potential strategies for communicating with the broader public about key aspects of the N126 Plan. These included:

- Convene a public meeting at Big Bear Retreat Center
- Share updates on social media
- Language is critical
 - Language in planning documents is often very technical and hard to understand
 - Create a glossary for users
 - Use plain language whenever possible
 - Incorporate pictures
 - Provide variety of formats

Next Steps

Joshua Carnahan explained that scoping for the EA will likely begin in December 2018, and the purpose and need will be available for additional review and feedback. Joshua also invited participants to reach out to himself or any members of the project team with additional questions, concerns, or ideas they would like to discuss further.

A public meeting to present the N126 Plan EA to property owners and interested citizens will be scheduled sometime in December.

Joshua also expressed gratitude to all who participated in the assessment and workshops, recognizing the time commitment that was dedicated to helping the BLM develop the issues and alternatives.